



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/254,316	03/04/1999	KATSUTOMO OHZEKI	946-113PCT	6799

2292 7590 01/22/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

HENDRICKSON, STUART L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1754 24

DATE MAILED: 01/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No 251316	Applicant(s) drzki
Examiner Wendy S.	Group Art Unit 11M

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/14/02

This action is FINAL.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-3, 7, 8, 11-16 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) 16 is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1-3, 7, 8, 11-15 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) 15 is/are objected to.

Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).

All Some* None of the:

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received
in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____ Int'l Inv. Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Oth. _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1754

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action. The request filed on 6/17/02 for Continued Examination (RCE) based on parent Application No. 09/254316 is acceptable and a RCE has been established.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 15, 'acidic starch' is unclear, especially as to what starches are not acidic. Note this is different from the 'acetic' starch previously claimed.

Claims 1-3, 7, 8 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over von Bonin et al.

The reference in column 2 and ex.1 treats graphite with a small amount of starch. This appears to result in the same product as presently claimed, due to the low starch concentration used.

Claims 2 and 3 appear to encompass sodium impurities in the water.

Claims 1-3, 7, 8 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by the abstract of JP 09147916.

The abstract teaches Lithium in cellulose (or acrylic)-coated graphite. A single, thin layer is taught which appears consistent with the teaching of 0.01 % polymer in the specification. Thus, no differences are seen.

Art Unit: 1754

Applicant's arguments filed 11/14/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The declaration does not show a *difference* versus the applied prior art; it only shows the desirability of the claimed range. Claim 1 is open to synthetic resins. The thickness of the layer is not claimed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Hendrickson at telephone number (703) 308-2539.



Stuart Hendrickson
examiner Art Unit 1754